

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning  
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

**BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES**

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** \_\_\_\_\_

**IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.**

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/882,440	06/15/2001	David Gerald Belanger	1999-0075	1948

7590 09/22/2004  
Samuel H. Dworetsky  
AT&T CORP.  
P.O. Box 4110  
Middletown, NJ 07748-4110

EXAMINER  
NGUYEN, THU HA T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2155	

DATE MAILED: 09/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/882,440

Applicant(s)

BELANGER ET AL.

Examiner

Thu Ha T. Nguyen

Art Unit

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 June 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims **1-29** are presented for examination.

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112**

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 15 recites "wherein each proxy multiplexor" in page 26, line 5 is unclear, since there is just only one proxy multiplexor as claimed in the invention. There is no mention about plurality of proxy multiplexor.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the selection of preferences" in line 3.

Claim 7 recites the limitation "the end user component " in lines 6-7.

Claim 15 recites the limitation "the end user component " in line 9.

Claim 24 recites the limitation "the received content" in line 9.

There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Appropriate correction is required.

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103**

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2155

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over **Nozaki** U.S. Patent No. **6,128,644**, in view of **Richardson** U.S. Patent No. **6,054,987**.

6. As to claim 1, Nozaki teaches the invention as claimed, including a computer readable medium having a computer program encoded thereon, comprising:

a first portion of said medium having a first program segment for facilitating the selection of preferences for information to be displayed as part of a service control component (col. 6, lines 9-19, col. 7, lines 25-52);

a second portion of said medium having a second program segment for receiving over a communication network information from a plurality of service providers in accordance with said selected preferences (abstract, col. 5, lines 36-67, col. 7, lines 37-col. 8, lines 43); and

a third portion of said medium having a third program segment for displaying said information within the service control component (col. 1, lines 22-41, col. 7, lines 8-col. 9, lines 11).

However, Nozaki does not explicitly teach wherein at least one of the plurality of service providers is represented in the service control component by a unique icon that includes real time status updates. Richardson teaches wherein at least one of the plurality of service providers is represented in the service control component by a unique icon that includes real time status updates (col. 1, lines 37-col. 3, lines 45, col. 5, lines 30-52). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Nozaki and Richardson to include an display icon that represented of service provider and provide real-time update because it would have an efficient communications system that can display, manage and monitor computer network in real-time.

7. As to claim 2, Nozaki teaches the invention as claimed, wherein a proxy multiplexor aggregates the information received from the plurality of service providers (figure 3, col. 7, lines 37-col. 8, lines 56).

8. As to claim 3, Nozaki teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the service control component is configured in conjunction with a browser (figures 1, 3, col. 5, lines 55-col. 6, lines 61, col. 7, lines 8-35).

9. As to claim 4, Richardson teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the service control component is an embedded control bar (figures 3-5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention

Art Unit: 2155

was made to combine the teachings of Nozaki and Richardson to have the same motivation as set forth in claim 1, supra.

10. As to claim 5, Richardson teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the service control component is an independent display object (figures 3-5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Nozaki and Richardson to have the same motivation as set forth in claim 1, supra.

11. As to claim 6, Richardson teaches the invention as claimed, wherein said unique icon is selectable by the user to retrieve additional information from a corresponding one of said service providers (figure 5, col. 5, lines 30-52). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Nozaki and Richardson to have the same motivation as set forth in claim 1, supra.

12. As to claim 7, Nozaki teaches the invention as claimed, including a service controller system for integrating information from a plurality of service providers, comprising:

a proxy multiplexor which receives information from the plurality of providers, wherein the proxy multiplexor aggregates the information from the plurality of providers (figures 1, 3, col. 5, lines 35-67, col. 7, lines 37-col. 8, lines 56); and

Art Unit: 2155

an end user service control component which receives information from the proxy multiplexor (figures 1, 3, col. 1, lines 22-41, col. 5, lines 55-col. 6, lines 19, col. 7, lines 8-col. 9, lines 11).

However, Nozaki does not explicitly teach wherein each respective provider is represented by an individual icon within the end user component, at least one of said icons displaying the most current information received from its associated provider. Richardson teaches wherein each respective provider is represented by an individual icon within the end user component, at least one of said icons displaying the most current information received from its associated provider (col. 1, lines 37-col. 3, lines 45, col. 5, lines 30-52). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Nozaki and Richardson to include an display icon that represented of service provider and provide real-time update because it would have an efficient communications system that can display, manage and monitor computer network in real-time.

13. As to claim 8, Nozaki teaches the invention as claimed, wherein at least one of the plurality of providers is an HTTP server (col. 1, lines 23-41, col. 6, lines 21-61).

14. As to claim 9, Nozaki teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the end user component is integrated as part of a browser (figures 1, 3, col. col. 5, lines 55-col. 6, lines 61, col. 7, lines 8-35).



15. As to claim 10, Nozaki teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the end user component is a stand-alone object (figures 1, 3, col. 5, lines 55-col. 6, lines 61, col. 7, lines 8-35).

16. As to claim 11, Richardson teaches the invention as claimed, wherein new providers may be added for display in the user's end user component via a centralized server (col. 1, lines 37-col. 2, lines 8). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Nozaki and Richardson to have the same motivation as set forth in claim 7, *supra*.

17. As to claim 12, Nozaki teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the centralized server is an HTTP server having SSL capabilities (col. 6, lines 57-61).

18. As to claim 13, Nozika teaches the invention as claimed, further comprising a second end user component, wherein both end user components receive information from the proxy multiplexor (figures 1, 3, col. 1, lines 22-41, col. 5, lines 55-col. 6, lines 19, col. 7, lines 8-col. 9, lines 11). However, Nozaki does not explicitly teach having individual icons representing others of the plurality of service providers. Richardson teaches having individual icons representing others of the plurality of service providers (col. 1, lines 37-col. 3, lines 45, col. 5, lines 30-52). It would have

Art Unit: 2155

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Nozaki and Richardson to have the same motivation as set forth in claim 7, *supra*.

19. As to claim 14, Richardson teaches the invention as claimed, wherein said individual icon may be selected to retrieve additional information from a corresponding one of said service providers (figure 5, col. 5, lines 30-52). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Nozaki and Richardson to have the same motivation as set forth in claim 7, *supra*.

20. As to claim 15, Nozaki teaches the invention as claimed, including a service controller system comprising:

a plurality of service providers that provide information and content to a plurality of users (figure 1, col. 5, lines 35-67);

a proxy multiplexor for each of the plurality of users that receives information and content from the plurality of providers, wherein each proxy multiplexor aggregates the information and content from the plurality of providers for each user (figures 1, 3, col. 5, lines 35-67, col. 7, lines 37-col. 8, lines 56); and

an end user control component which continuously receives updated information and content from the proxy multiplexor (figures 1, 3, col. 1, lines 22-41, col. 5, lines 55-col. 6, lines 19, col. 7, lines 8-col. 9, lines 11).

Art Unit: 2155

However, Nozaki does not explicitly teach wherein each respective provider is represented by an individual icon within the end user component each individual icon being updated whenever new information is provided from the respective service provider associated with that icon. Richardson teaches wherein each respective provider is represented by an individual icon within the end user component each individual icon being updated whenever new information is provided from the respective service provider associated with that icon (col. 1, lines 37-col. 3, lines 45, col. 5, lines 30-52). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Nozaki and Richardson to include an display icon that represented of service provider and provide real-time update because it would have an efficient communications system that can display, manage and monitor computer network in real-time.

21. As to claim 16, Richardson teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the end user component includes a display portion that contains the provider icons (figure 5, col. 5, lines 30-52). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Nozaki and Richardson to have the same motivation as set forth in claim 15, supra.

22. As to claim 17, Nozaki teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the end user component is integrated as part of a Web browser (figures 1, 3, col. col. 5, lines 55-col. 6, lines 61, col. 7, lines 8-35).

23. As to claim 18, Nozaki teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the end user component is a stand- alone display object (figures 1, 3, col. 5, lines 55-col. 6, lines 61, col. 7, lines 8-35).

24. As to claim 19, Richardson teaches the invention as claimed, wherein new providers may be added for display in the user's end user component via a centralized server (col. 1, lines 37-col. 2, lines 8). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Nozaki and Richardson to have the same motivation as set forth in claim 15, supra.

25. As to claim 20, Nozaki teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the centralized server is an HTTP server having SSL capabilities (col. 6, lines 57-61).

26. As to claim 21, Nozaki teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the proxy multiplexor is an executable without running on a user's machine (figures 1, 3, col. 5, lines 35-67).

27. As to claim 22, Richardson teaches the invention as claimed, wherein each individual icon is updated without action required of the user (col. 1, lines 37-col. 2, lines 8). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art

Art Unit: 2155

at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Nozaki and Richardson to have the same motivation as set forth in claim 15, *supra*.

28. As to claim 23, Richardson teaches the invention as claimed, wherein each individual icon provides an alert to the user when updated with new information (col. 1, lines 37-col. 2, lines 8). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Nozaki and Richardson to have the same motivation as set forth in claim 15, *supra*.

29. As to claim 24, Nozaki teaches the invention as claimed, including a method for displaying content from a plurality of service providers as part of a service control component, comprising:

receiving from a user a selection of preferences for receiving and displaying the content (col. 6, lines 9-19, col. 7, lines 25-52);

receiving over a communication network the content from the plurality of service providers in accordance with the preferences (abstract, col. 5, lines 36-67, col. 7, lines 37-col. 8, lines 43); and

displaying the content in accordance with the preferences (col. 1, lines 22-41, col. 7, lines 8-col. 9, lines 11).

However, Nozaki does not explicitly teach wherein at least one of the plurality of service providers is represented in the service control component by a unique icon that includes real time updates comprising at least some of the received content.

Art Unit: 2155

Richardson teaches wherein at least one of the plurality of service providers is represented in the service control component by a unique icon that includes real time updates comprising at least some of the received content (col. 1, lines 37-col. 3, lines 45, col. 5, lines 30-52). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Nozaki and Richardson to include an display icon that represented of service provider and provide real-time update because it would have an efficient communications system that can display, manage and monitor computer network in real-time.

30. As to claim 25-29, they are method claims directed for displaying content from a plurality of service providers of system claims 2-6. Claims 25-29 have similar limitations to claims 2-6; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

### **Conclusion**

31. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure (see PTO-892 attached).

32. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thu Ha Nguyen, whose telephone number is (703) 305-7447. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain T. Alam, can be reached at (703) 308-6662.


Art Unit: 2155

Any inquiry of a general nature of relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.

The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9306 for regular communications.

Thu Ha Nguyen

September 17, 2004

  
HOSAIN ALAM  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER